DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 039 SP 036 759

AUTHOR Young, Barbara N.
TITLE Theoretical Orientation to Reading and Student-Teaching Placement: Three Case Studies in Match and Mismatch Contexts.
PUB DATE Feb 96
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, February 21-24, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Placement; Reading Instruction; Research Methodology; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Student Perception of Teaching Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

Case study as a research methodology was used to provide a dense description and examination of many of the complex factors in the experiences of three selected student teachers and their cooperating teachers. This research effort examined the real or perceived effects of cooperating teachers' supervision on student teachers' attitudes, perceptions, philosophies, and behaviors during the student-teaching experience. The research investigated: (1) whether college instruction in methods classes was "washed out" by the student-teaching experience because of the strong dichotomy existing between practical theory and traditional classroom practice; and (2) whether the practicum experience serves merely to "socialize" the prospective teachers into established patterns of school practice relating to curriculum and instruction. The study looked at perceptions of three student teachers and transactions occurring between these student teachers and their respective cooperating teachers when pairs held the same theoretical orientation and when they held conflicting orientations to the reading process. Conclusions are addressed in terms of interpretation of data gathered in the case studies. Suggestions for future research and emergent questions concerning the practicum experience in general and the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship in particular are presented. (Contains 5 tables and 25 references.) (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Theoretical Orientation to Reading and Student-Teaching Placement
Three Case Studies in Match and Mismatch Contexts

ED 397 039

ABSTRACT

Case study as a research methodology was used to provide a dense description and examination of many of the complex factors in the experiences of three selected student teachers and their cooperating teachers. This research effort examined the real or perceived effects of cooperating teachers' supervision on student teachers' attitudes, perceptions, philosophies, and behaviors during the student-teaching experience. Given the widespread push to reform public education and teacher education programs, the demand is great for research that sheds light on the complex, highly-significant world of student-teaching.

Studies of what happens to student teachers during student teaching are vital and must be conducted to examine the effect of cooperating teachers' supervision on students' perceptions and experiences. Is college instruction in methods classes "washed out" by student-teaching experience because of the strong dichotomy existing between practical theory and traditional classroom practice? Does the practicum experience serve merely to "socialize" the prospective teachers into established patterns of school practice relating to curriculum and instruction?

This research examines perceptions of three student teachers and transactions occurring between these student teachers and respective cooperating teachers when pairs held the same theoretical orientation and when they held conflicting orientations to the reading process. Conclusions are addressed in terms of interpretation of data. Suggestions for future research and emergent questions concerning the practicum experience in general and the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship in particular are presented.

Purposes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara N. Young (Author)

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

(1) To comprehensively take into account the complexities present in the transactions and context of the field experience through the use of case study research methodology.

(2) To explore the field-based experiences of three selected student teachers and their cooperating teachers during the student-teaching practicum.

(3) To consider the significant influence of cooperating teachers on student teachers and resulting effects, if any, of transactions between the pairs.

(4) To examine perceptions of three student teachers and the transactions that occurred between these student teachers and respective cooperating teachers when student teachers and cooperating teachers held the same theoretical orientation and when they held conflicting orientations to the reading process.

5b36759

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Theory into Practice: Theoretical Orientation to Reading and Student-Teaching Placement/Three Case Studies in Match and Mismatch Contexts

To Match or Not to Match, That is the Question

Statement of the Problem

Research done on teacher education programs indicates that content learned during preservice course work may be forgotten as a result of the interactions, anxieties, and particular experiences that occur during student teaching (Hoy & Rees, 1977; Yee, 1969). Although the student-teaching experience is evidently the most influential component of the teacher education program, and the influence of the cooperating teacher is extremely significant, little attempt is made to select cooperating teachers based on specific criteria. Generally speaking, cooperating teachers are held to criteria such as having three to five years of successful teaching experience, the building principal's recommendation, and a Master's degree. At present, the traditional practice of arbitrarily pairing a student with a cooperating teacher is still the norm in most student-teaching situations across the country (Goodlad, 1991). Recent research indicates this common practice must be examined for possible changes if the practicum experience is to be made more effective (Goodlad, 1991; Holmes Group, 1990).

Specifically, there is a need for "research strategies that (will) enable the penetration of the complex and interrelated world of field-based experiences" (Zeichner, 1980, p. 52). Most research done in this area has relied too heavily on statistical data (Carter, 1993; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984). As a result, it has over simplified and ignored many complex factors present in the transactions and context of the field experience (Carter, 1993; Feiman-Nemser, 1983). Also, this research did not comprehensively take into account the complexities present in the interactions between student teachers and cooperating teachers, nor did it fully address questions concerning significant influence of particular cooperating teachers on student teachers and resulting effects, if any, of the transactions between the pair (Hoy & Rees, 1977).

Studies done by Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) have suggested that college instruction in methods is "washed out" by student-teaching experience because of the strong dichotomy existing between practical theory and traditional classroom practice. Other research has raised serious questions about the benefits of the student-teaching practicum and notes the student-teaching experience merely serves to "socialize" the prospective teachers into established, ineffective patterns of school practice relating to curriculum and instruction (Zeichner, 1980). As a result, studies of what <u>really</u> happens to the student teacher during the practicum experience are vital, and the narrow assumptions of the empirical-analytic paradigm of most studies must be replaced or supplemented by the inclusion of authentic, qualitative data which are embedded in the daily interactions and can only be gathered through

naturalistic inquiry methods (Carter, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Studies comparing student teachers' attitudes with attitudes of their cooperating teachers unanimously report significant changes in student-teachers' attitudes in the direction of those of cooperating teachers (McShane-Bechner & Ade, 1982; Yee, 1969). Although student-teachers' classroom actions, such as verbal behavior or instructional methods, are significantly affected by the cooperating teacher, and cooperating teachers are perceived by student teachers as the most influential aspect of the entire practicum experience (Friebus, 1977; Yee, 1969), the traditional practice of arbitrarily pairing a student teacher with a cooperating teacher is still the norm in most student-teaching situations across the country (Goodlad, 1991). Research directed to examination of the transactions that occur between student teachers and their cooperating teachers may shed significant light upon the student-teaching experience (Friebus, 1977; Yee, 1969). As a result of such research, data supporting careful, rather than random or arbitrary, pairing of student teachers with cooperating teachers may be obtained.

Research Design

Since theoretical orientation to reading is built upon different theoretical foundations concerning the nature of knowledge, it follows that materials and delivery, or curriculum and instruction, differ in the classroom depending upon which approach the teacher employs (see Table 1). Therefore, it is reasonable to question the extent to which student teachers are affected when their orientation is similar to or in conflict with the one being implemented within the classroom by their cooperating teachers (see Table 1).

In order to gain insight into these areas, the researcher utilized several data contexts, methods, and sources. Data consisted of observational field notes, transcribed audio-taped conference conversations, typed transcripts of reflective journals, reading course overviews, lesson plans, unit plans, children's work samples, Theoretical Orientation Reading Profile questionnaires, and interviews (see Tables 2 and 3).

The following questions framed the study:

1. Does the student teacher appear to experience any positive or negative effects as a result of a matched pairing placement with a cooperating teacher with regard to theoretical orientation to the reading process?

2. Does the student teacher appear to experience any positive or negative effects as a result of a mismatched pairing placement with a cooperating teacher with regard to theoretical orientation to the reading process?

The decision was made to focus this study on three pairs of student teachers/cooperating teachers, two mismatched pairs in relation to theoretical orientation to the reading process and

one matched pair (see Table 4). For ethical reasons, student teachers and cooperating teachers were not purposely matched or mismatched. Random, arbitrary pairing was assigned as usual. However, following student-teaching placement, pairs of student teachers and cooperating teachers were administered the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (TORP) (DeFord, 1979) in order to determine which pairs would be selected for the study. After potential pairs were identified through TORP scores (see Table 5), three specific pairs were chosen due to logistics and grade level considerations in addition to TORP scores (see Tables 4 and 5). Pairs were contacted in person and asked about participating in the study. All agreed. The same three student teachers identified in Phase One were again administered the TORP in Phase Three to ascertain possible theoretical orientation shift (see Table 5).

Conclusions: Pair One Mismatch

As profiled by the TORP, Student Teacher One and Cooperating Teacher One were mismatched (see Tables 4 and 5). The student teacher's initial score on the TORP indicated a Phonics orientation, and the cooperating teacher's score indicated a Whole Language orientation. Although the student teacher professed a belief in the Whole Language orientation practiced by the cooperating teacher and presented within the student teacher's university methods classes, when given control over instructional focus, the student teacher employed instructional techniques, materials, and methodology for teaching reading in keeping with a Phonics orientation. The cooperating teacher, on the other hand, had a Whole Language orientation and had implemented instruction for the teaching of reading in accordance with this philosophical belief system (see Table 1).

Since the three orientations, Phonics, Skills, and Whole Language, are presented as operating on a continuum, there are points of overlap in instructional practices, particularly in areas of proximity to another orientation. That is, the Phonics and Skills orientations tend to share practices, as do the Skills and Whole Language orientations, but there is little or no sharing between typical Phonics instructional focus and Whole Language. As a result, the student teacher's final TORP score probably would not be expected to change so completely that it reflected a Whole Language orientation. However, the student teacher's final TORP score change from Phonics to Skills indicated movement along the language continuum in the direction of her cooperating teacher's Whole Language orientation beliefs and practices.

As a result of Pair One's on-going dialogue concerning lesson planning and instructional strategies, the cooperating teacher and student teacher were able to address their differences in relation to theoretical orientation, and the cooperating teacher was able to offer guidance for lesson modification. The student teacher accepted these suggestions, saw them as "fun," and successfully implemented many of them. Encouraged by the cooperating teacher, the student teacher's lessons involved more literature, became more holistic, and involved more discovery

learning.

Cooperating Teacher One offered constructive criticism in a positive manner, provided feedback, guidance and support, and she created an overall atmosphere or context in which the student teacher felt encouraged and supported. Throughout the student-teaching experience the actions and attitude of the cooperating teacher were aimed at facilitating and guiding the student teacher. As a result, the student teacher was able and willing to experiment and take risks. The inquirer concluded that the student teacher did not appear to experience any significant negative effects as a result of her mismatched pairing placement with regard to theoretical orientation to the reading process. In fact, positive effects were recorded and commented upon by the student teacher:

> I found my student teaching experience a wonderful learning experience. My cooperating teacher was wonderful. We got along extremely well because we had a lot in common. We both enjoy incorporating whole language activities into the classroom. Not only was she my cooperating teacher, she was also a good friend. I could not have been any happier with my teacher. I will miss her and my students a great deal. (Entry 35, Reflective Journal)

Although Pair One held diametrically-opposing theoretical orientations to the reading process, with no overlap, their mismatched pairing placement did not produce negative effects in the student teacher. Rather, it produced positive effects due to the personality traits of the cooperating teacher such as openness, empathy, helpfulness, supportiveness, creativity, nurturing, understanding, encouragement, positive attitude, and kindness. As a result, the inquirer concluded this particular mismatch (i.e., Phonics Student Teacher/Whole Language Cooperating Teacher), in and of itself, did not cause the student teacher to experience negative effects.

This suggested to the inquirer that the personality traits of the cooperating teacher (e.g., openness, empathy, helpfulness, supportiveness, creativity, nurturing, understanding, encouragement, positive attitude, kindness), in addition to the belief system or theoretical orientation, were equally important as to whether or not the student teacher viewed the student-teaching experience as negative or positive.

Conclusions: Pair Two Match

As profiled by the TORP, Student Teacher Two and Cooperating Teacher Two were matched in regard to theoretical orientation (see Tables 4 and 5). The student teacher's initial score on the TORP indicated a Phonics orientation as did the TORP score of the cooperating teacher. When given control over instructional focus, the student teacher employed instructional techniques, materials, and methodology for teaching reading in keeping with a Phonics orientation. The cooperating teacher also had implemented instruction for the teaching of reading in accordance

with this philosophical belief system (see Table 1). On the second administration of the TORP the student teacher scored an even lower score which indicated a movement in theoretical orientation more decidedly in a Phonics orientation and that her initial belief system became even stronger as she put theory into practice. Also, it suggested that the cooperating teacher's beliefs and practices reinforced the belief system of the student teacher.

As a result of Pair Two's on-going dialogue concerning lesson planning and instructional strategies, the cooperating teacher was able to offer guidance, support, encouragement, and creative ideas for lesson modification. The student teacher accepted these suggestions, welcomed the teacher's intervention and guidance, and often commented upon their similarities in theoretical orientation, attitudes, expectations, and actual implementation of instruction. By the tenth and final week of the student-teaching experience, Student Teacher Two was developing lessons much like those of her cooperating teacher.

Cooperating Teacher Two offered constructive criticism in a positive manner, provided feedback, guidance and support, and she created an overall atmosphere or context within which the student teacher felt encouraged and supported throughout the student-teaching experience by the actions and attitude of the cooperating teacher. As a result, the student teacher was able and willing to experiment and take risks. The inquirer concluded that the student teacher did not appear to experience any significant negative effects as a result of her matched pairing placement with regard to theoretical orientation to the reading process.

In fact, positive effects were recorded and commented upon by the student teacher in her final Reflective Journal entry:

> As my student-teaching experience comes to an end I feel happy but also very sad. I look back on all of the things that happened to me, the experiences, the influence of my cooperating teacher, and the children and I smile. I think that I had a <u>great</u> student-teaching experience. I had great children and I had a great teacher. Sometimes I think I learned more in my student teaching than in <u>any</u> class I had in college.

Pair Two appeared to be in harmony from the first week through the last week of the practicum experience. Although Pair Two held the same theoretical orientation, and they agreed upon methodology, materials, instructional implementation, and had similar expectations with regard to the teaching of reading, the student teacher's positive perception of her cooperating teacher involved more than theoretical orientation similarity. For example, the student teacher repeatedly referred to her cooperating teacher's "positive attitude," willingness to "discuss and brainstorm" ideas with her, supportiveness, encouragement, and kindness. As a result, the inquirer concluded this particular match (i.e., Phonics Student Teacher/Phonics Cooperating Teacher), in and of itself, did not cause the student teacher to experience positive effects.

As in Case Study One, this suggested to the inquirer that the personality traits of the

cooperating teacher (e.g., openness, empathy, helpfulness, supportiveness, creativity, nurturing, understanding, encouragement, positive attitude, kindness), in addition to the belief system or theoretical orientation, were equally important as to whether or not the student teacher viewed the student-teaching experience as negative or positive.

Conclusions: Pair Three Mismatch

As profiled by the TORP, Student Teacher Three and Cooperating Teacher Three were mismatched in regard to theoretical orientation (see Tables 4 and 5). The student teacher's initial score on the TORP indicated a Whole Language orientation, and the cooperating teacher's score indicated a Phonics orientation. Since their scores clustered on opposite ends of the theoretical orientation continuum, little or no sharing of theory between Phonics and Whole Language orientations would exist. That is, they viewed the reading act and the teaching of reading very differently (see Table 1).

Initially, the student teacher felt obligated to follow the same basic routines, employ the same methodology, and make use of the same instructional materials that her cooperating teacher had established in accordance with her Phonics orientation. As a result, the student teacher unwillingly implemented a "phonics" approach under the guidance and direction of her cooperating teacher. Although the student teacher "wanted to make some changes," she soon realized that doing so would prove to be "difficult." As she noted in numerous reflective journal entries, Student Teacher Three expressed her views to the teaching of reading and a desire for change in relation to instructional implementation. She also expressed frustration, anxiety, sadness, disappointment, concern, anger, and discouragement as she interacted with her cooperating teacher and worked within her cooperating teacher's model of instruction.

Later, when Student Teacher Three assumed total, unsupervised control over instructional planning early in the student-teaching experience, she was able to implement a more holistic and integrated approach to reading instruction than her initial instruction. As evidenced in data collection, when the student teacher realized that the cooperating teacher did not intend to "monitor" her student-teaching in any manner whatsoever, the student teacher took over. She began making reading instruction, and other subject areas, more varied and integrated. Reading instruction was given a new format, with different guidelines, structural organization, and materials and methodology. In the opinion of the inquirer, as soon as the student teacher felt it was possible, she tried, as much as it was feasible within her placement site, to implement integration of reading, writing, listening, and speaking with other subjects, and to address the individual needs of her learners through her instructional organization and implementation. As a result of this quite "different" approach to instruction, the student teacher seemed more at ease and less stressed.

The student teacher's final TORP score was higher than her first score. This score

indicated a movement in theoretical orientation even more decidedly in the direction of a Whole Language orientation and away from that of her cooperating teacher's beliefs and practices. This final TORP score suggested that the student teacher's initial belief system became stronger as she put theory into practice and witnessed the phonic decoding method of teaching reading in practice. This finding was confirmed by the student teacher herself as she stated: "I think I have become even more convinced that a literature-based program is interesting and exciting to the students and I love teaching with books . . . . I can't wait to try it in my own classroom" (Final Interview).

As a result of this pair's minimal contact concerning lesson planning and instructional strategies, the cooperating teacher and the student teacher did not address their differences in relation to theoretical orientation. Due to her mostly inactive role, the cooperating teacher was not perceived by the student teacher as offering support, guidance, constructive criticism, or encouragement. According to the student teacher, the brief exchanges with her cooperating teacher were neither positive in tone, nor did they contain suggestions concerning materials or methods of instructional implementation. In fact, the student teacher perceived contact with her cooperating teacher as negative. The student teacher said that he cooperating teacher's input was stifling her creativity and opportunity to experiment.

Cooperating Teacher Three did not offer constructive criticism in a positive manner, and she did not provide guidance, feedback, support, or encouragement for the student teacher. The cooperating teacher created an overall atmosphere or context in which the student teacher felt frustrated, anxious, saddened, discouraged, disappointed, and angry throughout the student-teaching experience due to the actions and attitude of the cooperating teacher. As a result, the student teacher made use of strategies such as "strategic compliance" or "strategic redefinition" (Lacey, 1977), meaning she maintained a veneer of conformity in order to gain a favorable evaluation. However, she continued to maintain her original perspectives and put them into practice whenever the cooperating teacher's absence allowed her to do so. The inquirer concluded that the student teacher did appear to experience negative effects as a result of her mismatched pairing placement.

Student Teacher Three's final reflective journal entry, unlike the final journal entries of the other two student teachers, did not voice appreciation or gratitude for her cooperating teacher's guidance and/or for the student-teaching experience itself. Rather, she said:

> As my time in this classroom comes to an end, I hate to leave these kids. My classroom will be less rigid and structured. . . . I have arranged with Ms._____ (cooperating teacher) to return to this classroom for a few hours each week to read to the kids and listen to them read. I'm looking forward to it. . . . I want my own classroom and students and all the hard work that goes with being a positive teacher.

Like Pair One, Pair Three held diametrically-opposing theoretical orientations to the reading process with no possible overlap in their theories. Unlike the student teachers from Case Studies One and Two that were pleased with their student-teaching placements, the Case Study Three student teacher was displeased. Although the Case Study One student teacher also had a mismatched pairing placement with a cooperating teacher that held a diametrically-opposing orientation, Student Teacher One did not report her student-teaching experience as being negative as did Student Teacher Three.

As a result, the inquirer concluded that this particular mismatch (i.e., Whole Language Student Teacher/Phonics Cooperating Teacher), in and of itself, did not cause the student teacher to experience negative effects. Furthermore, the student teacher's overall perception of her cooperating teacher seemed to play a major part in whether or not the student teacher perceived the student-teaching experience as negative or positive. In these three case studies, certain personality traits of the cooperating teachers, in addition to their belief systems or theoretical orientations, appeared to be important factors in determining whether or not the student teachers viewed their practicum experiences as negative or positive. As a result, the inquirer concluded that the combination of direction of the mismatch in theoretical orientation in Case Study Three (i.e., Student Teacher/Whole Language orientation; Cooperating Teacher/Phonics orientation) and the personality traits of the cooperating teacher contributed significantly to the Pair Three student teacher experiencing negative effects during student teaching.

Implications for Teacher Education

This study has generated a number of emergent questions and areas for future research for those who study the elementary student-teaching experience in general and the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship in particular. Implications for teacher education are addressed within the emergent questions and areas of future research sections.

Emergent Questions

A number of emergent questions have been generated by this study. Questions are as follows:

1. Should observation and analysis of a cooperating teacher's interaction pattern precede any assignment of a student teacher?
2. Should there be a screening process in effect for selection of a cooperating teacher other than or in addition to a master's degree, building principal's recommendation, and three to five years of successful teaching experience regardless of theoretical orientation?
3. Should a cooperating teacher be carefully selected on the basis of motivation to be a teacher educator as well as on instructional expertise?
4. Should theoretical orientation identification of the student teacher and purposeful

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

matching/mismatching of the pair be a part of the student teachers' placement process?

5. Should "practice" preservice practicum/tutorial experiences be controlled for orientation match/mismatch to insure the student teachers' exposure to other orientations before they are assigned to student teaching?

6. Should student teachers' input in regard to placement with particular cooperating teachers be included in the placement process?

7. Should education programs plan teacher education courses such as Reading methods courses with theoretical orientation in mind?

8. Should the student teacher be instructed to behave based on what he/she believes, his/her theoretical orientation, or should he/she behave more like the belief system of the cooperating teacher?

9. If the student teacher is mismatched in regard to theoretical orientation, how is his/her theoretical orientation affected by the mismatch, and is the effect, if any, a long-term one?

10. If the student teacher is matched in regard to theoretical orientation, how is his/her theoretical orientation affected by the match, and is the effect, if any, a long-term one?

11. Does the student teacher have a qualitatively different student-teaching experience when the student teacher is reinforced by the theoretical orientation of the cooperating teacher than when the student teacher and cooperating teacher hold different theoretical orientations?

12. If the student teacher is mismatched in regard to theoretical orientation and has a negative experience, is this necessarily "bad" for the student teacher?

13. Is there a significant relationship between certain theoretical orientations and certain psychological characteristics?

14. If there is a significant relationship between theoretical orientations and certain psychological characteristics, how does this impact the interaction practices of, and potential as, teacher educators of potential teachers?

15. If there is a significant relationship between theoretical orientations and certain psychological characteristics, are specific theoretical orientation/psychological characteristics matches more conducive to a positive/negative student-teaching experience than other theoretical orientation/psychological characteristics matches?

16. Should student teacher and cooperating teacher be purposely matched/mismatched with regard to theoretical orientation/psychological characteristics?

Areas of Future Research

Several areas of future research have emerged from this study. Researchers may want to consider:

1. Designing more studies such as this one to add to the data base of subjective realities concerning interactions between student teachers and cooperating teachers during the student-teaching experience.

The naturalistic paradigm, with its multiple, divergent, inter-related view of reality, presents authentic, qualitative data which are embedded in daily interactions of individuals and can only be gathered through naturalistic inquiry (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Carter, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As a result, more qualitative case studies which retain the holistic and complex characteristics of real-life events that comprise social phenomenon would deepen our understanding of student teacher/cooperating teacher interaction patterns and the student-teaching experience.

2. Designing longitudinal studies to address whether theoretical orientation change during student teaching is internalized by student teachers or has a carry-over effect to first-year teaching practices.

Although such studies have been done on theoretical orientation change (attitudinal change) and resistance to theoretical orientation change (attitudinal change), few studies address whether this change is internalized by the student teacher or has a carry-over effect to first-year teaching practices. At present, there is a lack of residual effect studies and more research is indicated.

3. Expanding the research to include additional student teacher/cooperating teacher pairs in other geographic areas.

This study examined three student teacher/cooperating teacher pairs in the same middle Tennessee county school district. The schools were located in a small to medium-sized city. All of these student teachers were educated at the same university and were influenced by a similar set of circumstances and group of individuals. By including student teacher/cooperating teacher pairs in other geographic regions, it would be possible to look at the experiences of student teachers acting under different circumstances and having been influenced by different groups of educators.

4. Studying the opportunities offered in university classes to preservice and inservice teachers to question and discuss different methodologies and the underlying theories.

Teacher educators should be willing and prepared to examine their own professed and demonstrated theories. In addition, university classes such as Reading methods and Language Arts methods classes should provide information concerning belief systems--theoretical orientations--and the corresponding methodologies. If preservice and inservice teachers are

more knowledgeable about their beliefs and how these beliefs guide their practices, they will then be better able to evaluate their instructional approaches in light of pertinent research to find out why certain methods are better than others and what methodology fits which theoretical orientation.

5. Examining the possibility of allowing preservice teachers to have opportunities to give direction to their field experiences.

The cooperating teacher is "viewed as thier most significant professional helper" in this monumental first venture into the "real world" of the student teacher's chosen profession--the classroom. Rather than random placement of student teachers with cooperating teachers by the student-teaching office, potential preservice teachers could be prepared and encouraged to examine existing classroom practices and interaction patterns of potential cooperating teachers in light of their own developing belief systems--their theoretical orientations. They should have the opportunities to discuss, compare, and examine their own theories and practices with those of the cooperating teacher, preferably with the cooperating teacher, prior to the student-teaching experience. As a result, the student teacher would gain some control over the most significant aspect of teacher preparation and the most important event in the life of the preservice teacher rather than being passively controlled by it.

6. Examining the possibility of making more informed decision about student-teacher placement and instituting a screening process for selection of a cooperating teacher.

Given that the cooperating teacher tends to exert a substantial influence upon the student teacher, some conclude that the cooperating teacher is the most powerful socialization agent in the development of teaching style by the student teacher. Research has indicated a marked convergence of styles (i.e., interaction patterns), theoretical orientation, and instructional implementation in relation to certain pairings between cooperating teacher and student teacher (May, 1990; Zevin, 1974). Educators who want the student teacher to explore various patterns, methodologies, and styles of teaching may want to make more informed decisions about student-teaching placement based on things such as observation and analysis of a cooperating teacher's interaction patterns, theoretical orientation identification, motivation to be a teacher educator as well as instructional expertise, and certain psychological characteristics.

7. Designing studies to investigate the relationships among a teacher's stated theoretical orientation to reading and personality traits.

In view of the findings of this study, the inquirer concluded that in these particular case studies, certain personality traits of the cooperating teachers, in addition to their belief systems or theoretical orientations, appeared to be equally important as to whether or not the student teachers viewed their student-teaching experiences as negative or positive. As a result,

the inquirer further concluded that the combination of the mismatch (Student Teacher/Whole Language orientation; Cooperating Teacher/Phonics orientation) and the personality traits of the cooperating teacher contributed significantly to the student teacher experiencing negative effects during her student-teaching experience. Therefore, additional research to determine if certain personality traits are associated with particular orientations to the reading process is indicated.

8. Designing more studies that investigate the affective effects and behavioral effects on the student teacher both during and after pairing of student teacher/cooperating teacher with regard to affective factors such as theoretical orientation and personality traits.

As Puckett and McClam (1990) note, most of the studies on student-teaching supervision are written from the perspective of the college supervisor or the cooperating teacher, leaving out the student teacher. Studies that do include the perspective of the student teacher focus on roles and duties, leaving out the qualities of effective supervisors. Also, studies dealing with the student teaching experience usually do not examine what happens to the student teacher after the student-teaching experience.

With the widespread push to reform public education and teacher education programs, the demand is great for a body of knowledge to shed light on the complex world of the student teachers and their interactions with their cooperating teachers. Studies investigating affective effects and behavioral effects, both during and after the student-teaching experience, in regard to theoretical orientation/personality traits pairing placement are indicated.

References

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1992). *Qualitative Research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Burk, J. (1989). Six case studies of preservice teachers and the development of language learning theories (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1989), *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*, 01A.

Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 22*, 5-12, 18.

DeFord, D. (1979). A validation study of an instrument to determine a teacher's theoretical orientation to reading instruction (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1979).

Eisner, E. (1982). *Cognition and Curriculum.* New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy*. New York: Longman.

Friebus, R. (1977). Agents of socialization involved in student teaching. *Journal of Educational Research, 70*, 263-268.

Goodlad, J. (1991, November). Redesigning Teacher Education. *Educational Leadership*, 1-19.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1981). *Effective evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harste, J., & Burke, C. (1977). A new hypothesis for reading teacher research: Both the teaching of and learning of reading is theoretically based. In P. O. Person (Ed.), *Reading: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 32-40). New York: Mason Publishing.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hoy, W., & Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*, 23-26.

Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers.* London: Methuen.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

May, F. (1990). *Reading as communication: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co.

McShane-Bechner, R., & Ade, W. (1982). The relationship of field placement characteristics and students' potential field performance abilities to clinical experience performance ratings. *Journal of Teacher Education, 23* (2), 24-30.

Patterson, L. (1987). Responses to socio-psycholinguistic composition instruction in a secondary school classroom: Toward a transactional stance for teacher researchers (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A& M University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*, 12A.

Puckett, K., & McClam, T. (1990, Summer). Qualities of effective supervision. *Teacher Educator, 26* (1), 2-8.

Smith, M. (1990). A study of the socialization of student teachers with whole language perspective. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*, 03A.

Tabachnick, B., & Zeichner, K. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35*, 28-36.

Wise, A. (1988). Legislated learning revisited. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*, 328-333.

Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes student teachers? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 60* (4), 327-332.

Yin, R. (1969). *Case study research design and methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeichner, K., (1980). Myths and Realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*, 3-9.

Zevin, J. (1974, April). *In thy cooperating teacher's image: Convergence of social studies student teachers' behavior patterns with cooperating teachers' behavior patterns.* Paper presented at the Annual American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 087 781)

Table 1.

Basic Assumptions of the Technical and Reflective Approaches/Orientations. (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Smith, M., 1990)

Assumptions about	Approach: Technical	Approach: Reflective
Orientation	Behavioristic, mechanistic, bottom-up, outside-in.	Humanistic, organismic, top-down, inside-out.
Paradigm	Scientific, quantitative techniques.	Naturalistic, qualitative techniques.
Inquirer/Subject	Independent.	Inter-related.
Nature of truth statements	Generalizations, focus on situations.	Working hypothesis, focus on differences.
Reality	Convergent, singular, fragmentable.	Multiple, divergent, inter-related.
Knowledge	Law-like, generalizable to all situations.	Socially-constructive, time and context sensitive.
Student	Passive, standardized needs, prior histories neglected.	Active, interests and needs vary, prior histories important.
Teacher	Deliver standardized curriculum using predetermined techniques.	Make decisions on goals, content, and methods.
Curriculum	Predetermined, standardized, broken into discrete skills.	Flexible, based on needs and interests of students.
Reading Instruction	Phonics.	Whole Language.

Table 2.

Data Contexts, Methods, Sources.
(Burk, 1989; Patterson, 1987)

Context	Data-Gathering Method	Source
A. (Primary/Naturally-occurring Transactions)	1. Observational Field Notes. 2. Audio-taped conferences.	{Primary
B. (Artifacts/Products of Transactions)	1. Reflective Journals. 2. Reading Course Overviews. 3. Lesson Plans, Unit Plans. 4. Children's Work Samples.	{Primary
C. (Cued Responses)	1. TORP Questionnaires. 2. Interviews.	{Secondary

Table 3.

Data Phases, Collection Sequence, Contexts, and Sources.

Phase		Collection Sequence	Contexts/Sources
One	Week 1 of	1. TORP Questionnaires.	C/Secondary
(I)	Student Teaching.	2. Initial Interviews.	C/Secondary
Two	Weeks 2 - 9 of	1. Observational Field Notes.	A/Primary
(II)	Student Teaching.	2. Audio-taped Conferences.	A/Primary
		3. Reflective Journals.	A/Primary
		4. Mid-Point Interviews.	C/Secondary
		5. Reading Course Overviews.	B/Primary
		6. Lesson Plans, Unit Plans.	B/Primary
		7. Children's Work Samples.	B/Primary
Three	Week 10 of	1. TORP Questionnaires.	C/Secondary
(III)	Student Teaching.	2. Final Interviews.	C/Secondary

Table 4.

Student Teacher Pairing and Theoretical Orientation.

Pair	Grade	Theoretical Orientation	
		Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher
One/Mismatch	1	Phonics	Whole Language
Two/Match	2	Phonics	Phonics
Three/Mismatch	3	Whole Language	Phonics

Table 5.

TORP Scores.

Pair		Phase	Scores: Student Teacher	Scores: Cooperating Teacher
One	{Mismatch	I	61[a]	127[b]
One		III	84[c]	- -
Two	{Match	I	67[a]	65[a]
Two		III	55[a]	- -
Three	{Mismatch	I	117[b]	59[a]
Three		III	120[b]	- -

a = Phonics Orientation

b = Whole Language Orientation

c = Skills Orientation